

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INDUSTRIAL POLICY: THE  
WRONG ECONOMIC PRESCRIPTION

HON. DAN LUNGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, in recent months there has been increased discussion among Members of Congress, economists, and academicians concerning a national industrial policy.

Many industrial policy advocates paint a black or white picture. They suggest that either the United States can adopt a comprehensive, coordinated strategy in our Government policymaking so that our economy can better compete in the international marketplace, or if we do not enact such a program continued economic decline lies in store.

At first glance, it would seem difficult to oppose any concept which attempts to better coordinate Government policy. I became particularly interested in this issue because a proposal such as this could have significant impact on one of the largest trading complexes in the country (namely, the Port of Long Beach and the Port of Los Angeles) and the many businesses which it is my privilege to represent in my district. I also wanted to see if a so-called industrial policy program was the best means by which we could best improve the ability of our economy to compete and produce.

Because of the many unanswered questions over this issue, I recently had the opportunity as a member of the Joint Economic Committee to participate in a series of hearings on this subject. The two hearings which I chaired explored, first, "The Concept of Industrial Policy" and, second, "Japanese Industrial Policy: Lessons for America," looking at many of the real reasons behind Japan's economic success.

After studying this issue extensively for sometime now, I must express grave reservations over the industrial policy bills which are being considered and have been introduced in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, because of this, I would like to express some of the primary reasons why I believe a national industrial policy would inhibit rather than promote U.S. economic growth and competitiveness abroad. To adopt such a program, I fear, would simply be the

wrong economic course for our country to follow.

## THE BURDEN OF PROOF RESTS ON THE ADVOCATES

First, the point must be stressed that there is a heavy burden of proof which rests on the proponents of industrial policy to show that the capacity for a healthy economy or our country's ability to compete internationally necessarily hinges on some governmentally established industrial policy board. To date, that burden of proof has not been met to any significant degree.

The question being asked in the debate on this issue is whether the United States should have a comprehensive industrial policy. The heart of this question centers on what the proper role of Government in the economy should be.

## INCREASED INTERVENTION WOULD RESULT

Most supporters of industrial policy state that their primary objective is to coordinate Government policy. However, upon further evaluation of their proposals, one finds that industrial policy represents a dramatic, even revolutionary, social, political, and economic change in the basic functions of Government.

While many advocates will stress the need for greater cooperation among Government, labor, and business, virtually every proposal which has been advanced would simply result in greater intervention in the economy by the Government. Such a plan would typically require that the company or industry give up some right or meet some conditions in exchange for Government support or assistance. Those who support this quid pro quo concept, must show that increased intervention above and beyond the many smaller interventions the Government has made in the past necessarily improves the health of the economy.

Before our Government adopts a radical change, it must be shown beyond a shadow of a doubt that an industrial policy board will truly address the underlying problems it proposes to resolve.

Instead of looking at our already existing institutions, industrial policy supporters want to create more Government-sponsored and/or -dominated institutions. I contend that the essential positions and institutions are already in place to do a better economic job than has been done in recent years. Many believe that the Washington complex has already become too big of a bureaucracy. Why will more or bigger mean better?

INCREASED CENTRALIZATION IN A  
DECENTRALIZING ECONOMY

Second, I have concern that enacting an industrial policy would centralize the decisionmaking process in Government at a time when the economy and country are moving toward increased decentralization.

As John Naisbitt, author of *Mega-Trends* and a recent witness before the Joint Economic Committee, has written:

Centralized structures are crumbling all across America. But our society is not falling apart. Far from it. The people of this country are rebuilding America from the bottom up into a stronger, more balanced, more diverse society \* \* \* Americans are spreading out of small towns and rural areas and leaving the old industrial cities as decaying monuments to a past civilization. As we decentralize, we diversify and tend to stress our differences instead of our similarities.

A national industrial policy would be going against the natural shifts and adjustments toward decentralization that are currently occurring.

## POLITICIZATION OF DECISIONMAKING

Third, I believe that a politicization in a national industrial policy would occur. Instead of making economic policy decisions based upon economic merit, political choices would repeatedly prevail.

In reviewing some of the past decisions made in Washington one does not need a crystal ball to conclude that a politicization of the proposed process would inevitably result.

For example, in 1951 the Senate Banking and Currency Committee investigated the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which, incidentally, is very similar to the Industrial Development Bank being proposed in many of the industrial policy measures. Senator Fulbright, then chairman of the Senate Banking Subcommittee on Reconstruction Finance Corporation, stated that—

There's been a large number of instances in which the board of directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC) has approved the making of loans over the adverse advice of the corporation's most experienced examiners and reviewing officials, notwithstanding the absence of compelling reasons for doing so and the presence of convincing reasons for not doing so.

According to the Senate report, the RFC "thrusts money on the proprietors of roadside snake farms, cultivators of cactus plants for sale in dime stores, dental clinics, paperboard makers, \* \* \* a rainbow trout factory, and some very devious fellows who

wanted to be concessionaires for the roulette room in a Nevada hotel."

A more recent example of politics overcoming economic merit was the recent passage of the so-called jobs bill. This was the measure which was supposed to help address the problems of millions of unemployed Americans. Instead of targeting the assistance to those areas of the country with the highest levels of unemployment, much of the Government support appears to have gone to the congressional districts of the Members whose committee happened to have jurisdiction over the bill. Indeed, \$33 million was appropriated and obligated for a highway widening project in the House committee chairman's district. That fact is certainly not a criticism of any Member; rather, it is a criticism of the system which promotes such results. No wonder a July 9 editorial in the New York Times stated that "Congress does better at creating jobs programs than creating jobs."

Little evidence has been brought forth by industrial policy supporters to show that politics, not reason, will prevail in the decisionmaking by an industrial board or Industrial Development Bank. Senator WILLIAM PROXMIER perhaps stated it best when he wrote:

Money will go where the political power is; it will go where unions are mobilized, where mayors and governors, representatives and senators have the power to push it. Anybody who thinks that the government resources will be allocated on the basis of merit hasn't been in Washington very long.

#### PICKING WINNERS AND LOSERS IS INEVITABLE

Fourth, most industrial policy advocates claim that industrial boards would only offer suggestions for consideration by the Congress, but it seems to me the inevitable result would be the picking of winners, or picking of losers, or picking winners and losers. Despite the good intention of trying to achieve greater cooperation among the major economic actors, the process of determining which industries to support or where to allocate capital is, in effect, deciding which groups will benefit at the expense of other groups.

This is perhaps the key point: Government cannot create real credit or capital any more than it can create wealth. It can only reallocate already existing credit, capital, or wealth.

Moreover, I seriously question the ability of any board of government bureaucrats to make such predictions as to winners or losers. Who, for example, in the Government after World War II could have foreseen that research with grains of sand would lead to the development of the high tech industry as the industry of economic growth and new jobs in the near future?

Dr. Robert Noyce, cofounder of Fairchild Semiconductor and Intel Corp. and a National Medal of Science recipient, told the Joint Economic Committee how difficult it is to pick winners and losers as an active participant in the marketplace, not to mention the arduous task that would confront some government panel. He testified:

Since I have spent most of my life in entrepreneurial high technology business, I should be better than most in picking winners and losers. Yet I advised my wife a few years ago not to invest in the local start up which has turned out to be the most successful in American Industrial History to date—Apple Computer \* \* \*. I'm fortunate that my wife, like most, did not take my advice.

If anything, experience shows that the Government probably has a better record picking losers than it does winners.

#### REPRESENTATION ON THE INDUSTRIAL BOARD

Fifth, while the intent of an industrial policy would be to reach consensus decisions through cooperation, I am also concerned that in attempting to do so they would leave many important economic actors completely out of the picture. Most proposals would allow big business, big labor, big government to serve on and dominate some industrial board.

Many of the so-called new sunrise industries have expressed concern to me that under an industrial policy they would not be on an equal footing with some of the more traditional industries in presenting their views in Washington.

Even if room could be made to ensure the representation of all involved, it is in fact the larger companies and entities which are best prepared to use their own bureaucracies to deal with the Government bureaucracies. This would leave smaller firms at a competitive disadvantage.

Since small businesses—which comprise more than 95 percent of the total number of businesses in the United States—supply more than 80 percent of all new employment, almost 40 percent of our gross national product, as well as half of all major innovations and new technologies, one must seriously question the wisdom of creating a centralized, national industrial board.

#### INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BANK WILL DISTORT THE ECONOMY

Sixth, my strongest objection concerns a proposed industrial development bank board to directly reallocate credit and capital. In addition to the arguments I raised earlier concerning the politicization of the decisionmaking process and the inability to select winners and losers, I fear that such a bank would unnecessarily distort adjustments occurring within the economy.

The important point to be reiterated here is that such a board would not be

creating credit, but rather allocating credit which might otherwise have gone to other growing sectors of the economy.

This is the experience which occurred in Korea. The government there directed the credit in the country to certain selected industries. While the chosen industries were successful to a limited degree, the success was not achieved without costs being imposed on the overall Korean economy. For all intents and purposes the nontargeted industries had an unlegislated tax imposed on them since it was more difficult for them to obtain capital.

Mr. Kim Kihwan, of the Korea Development Institute in Seoul, has written that—

The basic message from this experience is that excessive intervention in the market creates inefficiencies which eventually hurt economic performance. By creating a deep and prolonged gap between the real and the effective cost of capital in certain industries and by discriminating excessively among industries, the policies contributed to both a slowdown in export growth and adverse developments in equity and income distribution. . . . The policy of extending preferential access to credit and treatment in taxation to strategic industries is being phased out. In its place the government is moving toward an incentive system which is neutral with regard to firms and industries and which will allow the effective cost of capital to more accurately reflect the true cost.

Since capital is not being created within the economy, the effect of allocating credit by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would target resources to some at the expense of others in the economy. This is analogous to a balloon or waterbed, which when depressed pushes outward on the opposite side while the total amount of air or water has remained constant. The point is that a greater cost on the economy is incurred by politically targeting resources to certain sectors over other sectors rather than allowing the cumulative effects of individual decisions in the marketplace to prevail.

#### WE MUST STRESS THE ECONOMIC FUNDAMENTALS

Because I do not believe that the burden of proof that an industrial policy is needed can be met, government policy should instead concentrate on a return to the fundamentals. We do not need a national industrial policy to stress the basics.

An editorial in the Wall Street Journal put it best:

The only industrial policy we need is one that offers the maximum possibility for individual decision makers to apply their initiative and imagination, take their risks and reap the rewards when their judgments are correct. As a group they will be right far more often than government bureaucrats not subject to the disciplines and incentives of the market.

Instead of allocating credit within the economy or targeting specific in-



dustries, we should focus on legislation to increase the amount of savings, research and development, incentives to work, invest and produce, and improve the quality of education our students receive. We should concentrate on promoting free trade throughout the world and U.S. competitiveness in exports. The Government policy objective should be the development of sound fiscal and monetary policies that avoid unnecessary shifts in response to every change in the economy. I also believe that the Government has a valuable role to play in encouraging worker retraining programs to assist with the transitions that are taking place within the economy.

But to achieve these objectives, a return to the fundamentals rather than the creation of a national industrial policy board is the key for establishing the foundation for increased jobs and sustained economic growth. That in the end should be the aim of our policies.

THE BEST AND THE BRIGHTEST ARE NOT HERE IN WASHINGTON

Mr. Speaker, there are many other points I could raise against the consideration of an industrial policy, however, if there is anything I believe we should have learned from our experience in Vietnam, it is that the best and the brightest have not necessarily been proven to be in Washington. I am especially not convinced that a panel of bureaucrats can or should make decisions that have been traditionally made individually by American consumers, workers, investors and businesspeople.

Those who advocate an industrial policy have an overwhelming burden of proof to carry in order to show that an industrial policy is needed to increase jobs and improve economic growth.●

#### THE DAY OF SOVIET SHAME

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was 15 years ago, on August 21, 1968, that over half a million Soviet and Warsaw Pact troops invaded the sovereign state of Czechoslovakia. This flagrant violation of international law, the "Day of Soviet Shame" was the final episode in what had been a moderating period for the Soviet-dominated state.

Today I urge my colleagues to never forget the plight of Czechoslovakia, whose people have always been steadfast friends of our Nation. The many Czech, Slovak, and Subcarpatho-Ruthenian descendants living in the United States have contributed greatly to the continued growth of our coun-

try; they are amongst this Nation's most loyal citizens.

The people of Czechoslovakia have been enslaved by the illegitimate government that took power 15 years ago, firmly entrenched in the blind ideology of the Soviet Union. The continued occupation of that country is a crime against the right to determine one's goals and destiny. Czechoslovakia has been denied this right, its people enslaved by the arm of Soviet domination and paranoia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we renew our resolve against Soviet domination in Czechoslovakia. The brutal silencing of this freedom loving people is a constant reminder of the Soviet Union's flagrant violation of international law.

On this, the anniversary of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia 15 years ago, I ask that my colleagues join me in decrying the continued Soviet military presence in that nation. We must never forget the courageous men and women of Czechoslovakia, as we are their only hope.●

#### DISINVESTMENT STUDY

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the idea of portfolio disinvestment of holdings in U.S. firms doing business in South Africa has beguiled State and municipal assemblies and university trustees over the past year. It is seen by its proponents as a way to damage the economic prospects of that country, and cause it, thereby, to alter its domestic policies. It is also seen, somewhat mysteriously, as a benefit to the black population of South Africa. However well meaning these initiatives are, their impact on South African black employment certainly promises to be negative, and their cost to the pension and other trust funds affected is definitely so—as indicated by such observations as those hereto appended.

Mr. Speaker, another point missed by these initiatives is the leadership role played by U.S. firms in improving employment, health, and educational opportunities for nonwhites in South Africa. In the past few years U.S. firms have invested some \$50 million toward these objectives.

Mr. Speaker, it is both natural and proper for Americans to seek measures to bring justice to any part of the world where injustice obtains. But I would hope that this particular expedient has run its course, before it does any further damage to our own society as well as the people we are trying to help in South Africa.

I submit the following articles to be printed in the RECORD.

[From Pensions & Investment Age, June 13, 1983]

#### SOUTH AFRICA INVESTMENT STUDY

##### HIGHER RISKS, LESS DIVERSITY SEEN IN DIVESTED PORTFOLIOS

COLUMBUS, OHIO.—Divesting the stock of companies doing business in or with South Africa could have "significant consequences" for a pension fund, an Ohio group states.

According to a report by the Ohio Retirement Study Commission, higher risks and less diversification could result from total divestiture.

But the study also states "it is debatable whether divesting and excluding 'South African investments' achieves anything."

"There is . . . somewhat more support for the proposition . . . supporting a policy which pressures American companies to set a good example in their South African operations . . ."

The study was conducted by the commission at the request of the Ohio Legislature in response to two bills that would affect portions of the five state public pension funds. The funds have assets totaling more than \$11 billion.

Both bills would prohibit investment in American corporations that have any business relationship with South Africa or investments located in South Africa.

One bill adds an additional prohibition against investing in any bank or building and loan association that makes loans to either the South African government, South African businesses or a subsidiary or affiliate of a U.S. company operating in South Africa, according to the study.

Both bills are broadly drawn and the aim is the same—to help institute an economic boycott against South Africa, the study adds.

The commission raises—and attempts to answer—four questions about the restriction of pension fund investments in U.S. companies with South African business operations:

Would a restrictive investment strategy result in a lower rate of return on investments, thus jeopardizing future pension benefits?

Would the use of restrictive investment criteria violate the legal and fiduciary responsibilities of the pension fund trustees?

Would such a strategy, in the aggregate, influence American corporate policy in this area?

Would the strategy influence the South African government in the area of race relations?

The commission said that while the evidence is not conclusive that lower returns would result, higher risk and lower diversification might indeed result. However it said that as long as other investment opportunities offer equal return potential, and there are no diversification problems, South Africa related companies could be excluded without violating the trustees' responsibilities.

The study added it was debatable whether such a strategy would affect policies directly because South Africa is not overly dependent on U.S. investments.

Although few public pension funds have adopted restrictive investment strategies dealing with South Africa, those that have fall into three categories, according to the study.

Some funds have opted for a total divestment/exclusion portfolio strategy; a second group has followed a "selective divestment/exclusion" strategy where a set of criteria

are used in a company-by-company approach; and still others have opted for a "concerned or active shareholder" strategy. This last approach enables the investor to become an active participant in supporting various shareholder resolutions on South African issues as they relate to U.S. companies.

The commission study suggests adopting either the second or third strategies.

If the Ohio Legislature approved a bill requiring total divestment of the five Ohio funds, 15% to 20% of the combined assets, about \$1.98 billion, would be affected, according to 1980 data used in the report.

The study asserts a policy of total divestiture could have "significant consequences and might result in lowered returns, higher risks and less diversification."

However, should the second option be adopted—following a very selective divestment/exclusion policy, only 1% to 2% of the combined assets might be affected, depending on the policy's wording.

If the third option were adopted, there would be no effect on the Ohio funds, the study said.

Oddly enough, Ohio laws already contain language encouraging investment in Ohio-based companies. The Commission said that 4%, or \$253 million, of the Ohio State Teachers Retirement System assets was in "Ohio companies" that do business in South Africa. Total investments by the system in companies doing business in South Africa were \$1.3 billion—21%—as of Jan. 1.

The commission also studied the cost of adopting each policy.

Three areas in pension fund management were found to be costly when pursuing a policy of restricted investments.

The first and most important cost would be that the portfolio becomes less attractive in terms of return, risk and diversification, according to the commission.

Second, if a major divestment or exclusion strategy is adopted, large transaction costs would result.

Using transaction cost statistics taken from a State of California Retirement System's study, the commission calculated a minimum transaction cost of between \$30 million and \$40 million would ensue to the Ohio funds as they stood in 1980.

Another cost to the Ohio funds would be the staff time required to institute and maintain the restrictive investment policy.

[From Pensions & Investment Age, June 13, 1983]

#### DIVESTMENT: INFORM THE TAXPAYERS

Once again, the issue of investing in companies doing business in or with South Africa is heating up. As reported elsewhere in this issue, 22 states and eight local governments are confronted with legislation requiring their pension funds to divest themselves of the stocks of companies with South African connections.

Those pushing such legislation are attempting to make a political statement of their revulsion at the South African policies of apartheid.

Those opposing the legislation are concerned about the impact of divestiture on the investment returns earned by the public employee pension funds and, ultimately, on the taxpayers who, in most cases, have not been consulted about the proposed restrictions.

Proponents argue that the divestiture would have no impact on the investment returns, and often refer to limited studies in

which investment returns actually have been improved by such divestiture.

Opponents argue in response that the cases cited by proponents deal with only small funds, not with funds investing billions of dollars and that the studies have not considered the relative risk of the South Africa-free portfolios.

Closer examination of one example by Prof. Roy Schotland of Georgetown University Law School showed the South Africa-free portfolio was 16% riskier than the portfolio free to invest in South Africa, yet provided investment returns only 3% greater.

That is, in this instance, the risk-adjusted returns of the portfolio prohibited from South Africa-related stocks was significantly lower.

In addition, as Prof. Schotland and others point out, the restricted portfolios are necessarily less liquid, causing problems for the billion-dollar state and local government pension plans.

Thus, long-term investment returns are likely to be lower, means higher taxes or lower benefits.

The problem with such restrictive legislation is that political activists are attempting to use public monies to make statements. Others might oppose apartheid, but believe that divesting funds of the stocks of companies doing business in South Africa is a useless gesture.

Before such restrictions are placed on any public pension fund, there at least should be full public discussion of the potential costs of such restrictions to the taxpayers and beneficiaries, and then there should be a referendum.

Only if the taxpayers are fully informed that such a restriction might increase their taxes or might reduce future benefits for the beneficiaries, and then vote in favor of it, should such a restriction be imposed.

[From the Boston Herald, May 25, 1983]

#### WE HURT OURSELVES

Punching oneself in the mouth in order to make a protest against the brutality of a bully in another corner of the world sounds pretty stupid. Right?

Well, don't laugh too soon. We're doing just that here in Massachusetts. So far it has cost us \$14.4 million worth of pain without even bruising the bully, and it could cost us even more in the very near future.

We're saddled with a public pension system that is so deep in the hole financially that it is just about out of sight—and it's getting deeper every day. Yet four months ago our state government, as a means of showing its opposition to the repressive racial policies of South Africa, chose to unload its stock holdings in firms doing business with that nation. In doing so we took a loss that came straight out of the pension funds for teachers and state employees which were used to make those investments. Now that Governor Michael S. Dukakis has approved a similar "divestiture" law covering our investments in companies with business links to Northern Ireland, our losses will in all likelihood mount.

The apartheid in South Africa, injustices committed on both sides in Ulster, are all abhorrent to the majority of Massachusetts residents.

But what are these measures achieving? Are there blacks in South Africa liberated today because of the sacrifices of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts? Are the two sides in Ulster closer to peace because of the gestures of the Dukakis administration?

What confuses us in all this is the fractured logic that has been employed in high places.

Sure, the South African regime is not run by a bunch of nice, humane guys.

But maybe Mr. Dukakis should check out some of the other nations who are pumping millions of dollars of imports into this country.

The Saudis, for instance. Next time Mr. Dukakis fills up his gas tank he might remember that the sheikhs sitting on all that oil treat women about as well as many of his electors treat their household pets.

And India. We guess Mrs. Gandhi would be invited to the State House if she showed up in town. Yet the manner in which her nation has abused and dispossessed The Untouchables is one of the most shocking in history.

And what about the Soviets and how they have treated the Ukrainians, the Tadzhiks the Uzbeks? Any Dukakis plans for a ban on business with them?

The list goes on, but it would be laboring the point.

Divestiture is futile. Like a self-inflicted punch on the nose, the only pain we'll notice is our own. ●

#### SALUTE TO MARGARET S. PLUMMER

#### HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on August 10, 1983, Mrs. Margaret S. Plummer of Martinez, Calif., will be honored for her service in the National Weather Service's Cooperative Weather Observer program. I am pleased to have this opportunity to salute Mrs. Plummer and want to share her contribution with my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

The Commerce Department's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration recently paid tribute to Mrs. Plummer's more than 31 years of continuous and exceptional service as a volunteer in the field of meteorological observations by awarding her the John Campanious Holm Award. Although many of us in this Chamber may not realize the significance which this award carries, Mrs. Plummer may be duly honored to receive one of the highest awards granted by cooperative service. This award is named after Rev. John Campanious Holm, who, in 1644, took the first known weather observations in this country, without the use of instruments.

In this period of budget cutbacks and staff shortages, volunteers play an increasingly important role in maintaining vital services to the community and the Nation. With more than 12,000 of her fellow volunteers, Mrs. Plummer has helped document our Nation's climate with dependable and accurate daily records of temperature and precipitation. I join the residents



of Contra Costa County and the staff of the Commerce Department's NOAA in congratulating Mrs. Plummer and wishing her much success in the future.●

**LIBRARY OF CONGRESS INCIDENT SHOWS HOW POORLY WE ARE ABLE TO DEAL WITH JAPAN—WAKARIMASEN**

**HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, in the past, I have expressed concern to my colleagues in Congress about the disparity of the amounts of technical information flowing from the United States to Japan and from Japan back into the United States. I have suggested that the root of this problem lies in the lack of qualified personnel in this country with the ability to translate often times important Japanese technical and scientific information into English. I began to look for a possible solution or at least a means toward improving the imbalance. It seemed to me that the most obvious course of action was to look at how those whom we are competing with have achieved so much more success in the accumulation, translation, and dissemination of worldwide technical information—namely, the Japanese.

My staff called the Japanese Embassy to obtain two Japanese laws that established the Japanese Information Center for Science and Technology, a state-run organization in that country that has as its primary purpose the collection and dissemination of foreign technical information. I thought that perhaps I might be able to use these laws as models for similar U.S. legislation. There was one problem, however: the laws given to me were printed—naturally—in their native Japanese.

Mr. Speaker, I, of course, thought this was just a minor and very temporary setback. As a Member of Congress, I have at my disposal the greatest library, resource center, and reference center in the world—the Library of Congress. Surely, I believed, they would have no difficulty translating a legal document of one of the world's most influential nations—a nation famous for its 1,000-year history of great literature and modern-day Nobel laureates. Unfortunately, the Library's translation service had no one currently on the staff fluent in legally technical Japanese and, thus, they were unable to fulfill my request, although they offered to contract the job out for \$900 or \$64 per page. But, they assured me that if I ever needed anything translated from such technologically powerful languages as Lithuanian or Romanian, there would be no

problem. In fact, even if a major technological breakthrough were developed by a Roman writing in Latin, they could handle it. Yet, for Japanese—that insignificant language of the largest research population per capita in the world, the language of industry that is quickly eroding the premier position of U.S. industry in the automobile, steel, and electronics markets—for Japanese, there was no need for a technical translation service.

Mr. Speaker, I am not critical of the Library; perhaps they simply do not get many requests for the translations of Japanese technical documents. But I am critical of the prevailing attitude in American industry and government that believes we can afford to ignore the wealth of original and creative technical advances currently being developed in Japan.

I am sharing this story with you simply because the stark reality, no pun intended, of the situation is that unless we improve the flow of technical information from Japan into our own country by asking for more Japanese technical and scientific information, we will quickly find ourselves behind our Japanese competitors with no chance to catch up again. In the meantime, I will get these documents translated, even if it means asking the Japanese Government to do what the American legislative branch cannot—translate Japanese into English.●

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

**HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to official business, I was unable to be present on the floor during two rollcall votes on August 4. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 321, approving the journal of August 3, and "aye" on rollcall 327, approving House Resolution 299, the rule on H.R. 3391, Trade Act of 1974 Amendments.●

**COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 3409**

**HON. LEON E. PANETTA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, today, August 4, 1983, both the House and Senate approved amendments to H.R. 3409, the Federal Supplemental Compensation Act amendments, that would expand and extend the current Federal program to distribute Government-owned surplus commodities to needy persons and institutions such as schools, child care centers, and elderly

feeding programs. As I mentioned on August 4, these amendments represent a compromise that was hastily drawn just prior to House and Senate passage. As a consequence, there may be conflicting interpretations as to what was agreed upon. As the primary House Member involved in these negotiations and in my capacity of chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations, and Nutrition of the Committee on Agriculture, I would like to present my understanding of what was agreed to. In general, it is my belief that where congressional intent is ambiguous or unclear, the issue should be resolved in a manner consistent with the commodity distribution bill passed by the House, H.R. 1590.

Basically, H.R. 3409 includes the most important elements of H.R. 1590, the Emergency Food Assistance and Commodity Distribution Act of 1983, that was passed by the House on June 16, 1983, by a 389 to 18 vote. The bill is not simply an extension of the commodity distribution program mandated in the jobs bill, Public Law 98-8, but represents an expansion and revision of that program. It includes various provisions and concepts taken from H.R. 1590, S. 17 (the bill passed by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry), and Public Law 98-8.

The bill would mandate operation of a commodity distribution program for 2 years. It would require the Secretary of Agriculture to distribute, without charge or credit, all available price supported commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation and not committed for another use to eligible recipient agencies. While the Secretary would have discretion to determine what quantities of commodities are in excess of those needed for other commitments, his discretion would not be unlimited. The Secretary would be expected to have specific other uses in mind in order to withhold distribution of available supplies of commodities. The law requires him to "make maximum use of the Nation's agricultural abundance."

H.R. 3409 would generally continue distribution to the same recipient agencies eligible under Public Law 98-8. The list of eligible agencies in the bill is not intended to be exclusive. The Secretary and the States would have discretion to authorize participation of other agencies that generally serve the purposes of the act. The reference to the eligibility of charitable institutions, to the extent that needy persons are served, is not intended to be a strict limitation on these institutions such that only needy persons within them can be served. It is intended to limit participation to charitable institutions that serve, at least in part, needy persons.

H.R. 3409 would require that commodities generally be provided to emergency feeding centers on a priority basis. As Senator DOLE pointed out in the August 4 Senate floor debate, this would not be an exclusive priority. Traditional outlets such as schools would continue to receive their historical share of these commodities. If additional commodities are available, those serving the needy would generally have first call on them.

Under these amendments, the Secretary of Agriculture would continue to be required to pay for the costs of initial processing and packaging of commodities into forms and quantities suitable for household and institutional use, as well as the costs of transporting commodities to the States. He would be authorized to pay such costs from funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation or utilize any other funding at his disposal. The Secretary would not be permitted to utilize any of the \$50 million in annual appropriations authorized under H.R. 3409 for State and local administrative costs to pay for initial processing and packaging of commodities, or transporting them to the State or local level.

The up to \$50 million in annual funding authorized for State and local administrative costs is to be made available in advance upon request of eligible recipient agencies. The Secretary and the States would have discretion to assure that advance funding requests are reasonable. However, the availability of advance funding is a key element in assuring maximum effectiveness in program administration, and the Secretary should facilitate adequate advance funding for eligible agencies, up to the limits specified in this bill.

A minimum of 20 percent of the funding under this bill is to be made available to agencies that directly serve needy persons. The remainder of the funding is to be utilized by the States generally to cover the costs of storage and distribution to all eligible outlets, including both emergency feeding outlets and traditional outlets such as schools, child care centers, elderly feeding programs, and others.

The plain language of the bill governs the use of the administrative funding authorized. There is no direction in the bill, and no intention on the part of Congress, that States use storage and distribution funds provided under the authorization exclusively for costs relating to emergency feeding centers. There is no intention on the part of Congress to require States to maintain systems to account for which storage and distribution costs have been incurred in relation to emergency feeding centers and which costs have not. If it had been intended to limit the States ability to utilize the funding to cover the costs of distributing commodities to emergency agencies, it

would surely have been so provided in the law. I understand this may involve a change in how administrative funding has been distributed under Public Law 98-8 and this is precisely what is intended.

I would emphasize that no administrative funding is to be provided directly to schools and other traditional outlets to cover their costs once they have received commodities. However, the States would be expected to utilize funding available to them, after the 20-percent allocation to emergency feeding programs, to generally pay the costs of storage and distribution in relation to all eligible outlets.

One additional area addressed by H.R. 3409 concerns the eligibility of persons to receive commodities through agencies that distribute to individual households. H.R. 3409 makes clear that only those persons who meet some needs test would be eligible. The determination of who is needy would be left to the States, subject to the approval of the Secretary.

I do think this is a constructive change and should help address whatever problems there may be in the displacement of commercial sales of commodities when nonneedy persons receive commodities. I would emphasize that this change would not authorize the Secretary to issue specific, uniform, eligibility requirements for this program. That determination should be left to the States. The Department may want to issue general guidance and guidelines to assist States. However, I believe it would be a serious error to limit participation in this program only to persons who are already participating in other programs, such as food stamps, supplemental security income, and aid to families with dependent children.

This commodity distribution program needs to be available for all the persons in our society who "fall through the cracks." There are many people who either are not eligible or choose not to participate in these programs, but are in great need of food assistance.

That concludes the major points I wanted to make about the contents of the bill. I would like to add a few comments about the process that led to its final passage and several provisions that were not included in the bill.

Late this afternoon, August 4, 1983, I learned that the Senate intended to add commodity distribution amendments to H.R. 3409. These amendments were to be added in such a way that, as a practical matter, no conference would be possible. Since the House had already passed the unemployment compensation amendments in H.R. 3409, the Senate intended to add the commodity distribution amendments to them and immediately adjourn for the summer recess. This meant that any objection on the

House side to the commodity distribution amendments would not only jeopardize that part of the bill, but also the unemployment compensation in benefits that H.R. 3409 would provide for many Americans.

When I learned of this situation, and after consulting with ranking minority member, BILL EMERSON, I attempted to gain some changes in the Senate amendments to make them more consistent with H.R. 1590. While some of these proposed changes were accepted, several important provisions were not.

Two provisions of H.R. 1590 relating to the replenishment of the food security wheat reserve were not included in the Senate amendments. Similarly, specific provisions relating to the level of commodities provided to schools and other traditional outlets and the use of administrative funding to deliver commodities to these outlets were not in the final bill. While I believe these latter concerns in relation to traditional outlets should be adequately addressed when the administration implements the law, the protections for the food security wheat reserve have been weakened.

I relate all of this history so that the many Members who have expressed interest in various aspects of this legislation will better understand why it was dealt with so summarily on August 4, 1983. While I believe that the legislation that has emerged is very worthwhile—a 2-year program has been set in place, administrative funding has been provided—I would have much preferred if several additional provisions from H.R. 1590 had been included. Unfortunately, it was not possible under the circumstances despite our best efforts.●

#### BETTER LIFE FOR ELDERLY IS LEGACY OF OLDER AMERICANS ACT

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, the 1973 amendments to the Older Americans Act, which first became law in 1965, brought forth the concept of area agencies on aging to develop and coordinate needed services for the Nation's increasing numbers of elderly citizens.

Today, area agencies on aging have become valued institutions in America's basic social service structure. The value of that landmark legislation is demonstrated daily through the services rendered by these agencies.

I am pleased to draw to the attention of the House of Representatives the accomplishments of one such agency in particular, the Area 4 Agency on Aging in California. This agency serves over 165,000 senior citi-



zens in the counties of Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, Sierra, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba.

The increased awareness we have today of the problems of the elderly had been long in coming. Thanks to the historic work of the Johnson administration and the Congresses of the 1960's, America began to take note of the financial and emotional hardships suffered by many of our elderly in a turbulent, youth-oriented society.

Mr. Speaker, while our Nation has become more aware of not only the problems of the elderly, but also of the real contributions of the elderly, we are still a long way from realizing the dream of secure, dignified retirement for all our citizens. But we have made progress, and the area agencies under the Older Americans Act are part of that progress.

The Area 4 Agency on Aging provides and oversees many services to the community, such as general information and referral services, transportation, health screening and education, in-home services (such as assisting in household repairs to enable the elderly to live independently in their homes), legal services, meal delivery, nursing home assistance and companion programs.

On the occasion of an open house September 1 sponsored by the Area 4 Agency on Aging of California, I wish to commend this organization on its valuable service to the elderly and the community as a whole.●

#### VOTER INTEREST AND PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1983

**HON. TOM CORCORAN**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 200 years, the American two-party system has functioned well. At the present time, though, it is threatened by changes in law and practice. In order to preserve and shore up our historical two-party system, on May 11 I introduced legislation that would allow the Democratic and Republican parties to return to their former strength in the electoral process. Prompt enactment of this legislation, H.R. 2976, the Voter Interest and Participation Act of 1983, will help the American people have additional confidence that their governmental system is responsive to their needs. By moving on my bill now, Congress can substantially improve the climate for political parties prior to the next election.

Let me review some of the developments that have made this legislation necessary. Our two-party system is almost unique in the world today. In countries with a parliamentary form

of government, there tends to be a large variety of parties competing for office. Canada's four parties, Britain's three parties, and the multiparty system of Western Europe are examples of this. Multiparty systems survive in parliamentary systems because there is generally control of the executive branch by the Parliament. Often, governments rise or fall on coalitions. Frequent votes of confidence occur to insure that such governments remain true to the wishes of the voters.

One-party states exist in a variety of forms, especially in the developing world and Moscow's orbit. They argue that elections, or at least competitive elections, destabilize the government. A kind of corporate responsiveness is credited to such systems by their creators.

I would like to emphasize that there is nothing magical about a two-party system. As I have noted, two-party systems are the exception, rather than the rule in today's world. But the two-party system has served the United States very well until very recently. In the past 10 years, assaults on our two-party system in law and practice have weakened our two great political parties. The result is that the American people have less and less confidence that our political parties can form the basis for governing. These threats to such valuable institutions and symbols of our Republic must be ended. My legislation would effectively improve the ability of the Democratic and Republican Parties to lead our electoral system once again.

What threats have developed to the two parties? First, party organizations at the precinct, congressional district, State, and National levels have been weakened in the name of reform. Both parties lack their former ability to nominate candidates for office having the support of most people from the party in a given geographic area. In place of this, candidates are almost completely free to act on their own. Typically, a candidate for office decides that he will be a candidate, organizes his own campaign, raises his own funds, develops his own strategy, and he, alone, is responsible for all of these things. Candidate selection, campaign organization, fund raising, strategy and responsibility used to have important components from the Democratic and Republican parties. By allowing or encouraging candidates to do everything or almost everything on their own, in the name of election reform, voters are given enormously difficult choices. Instead of using the position of the two political parties as reference points to evaluate candidates, voters must ascertain the gradations of candidates on their own. It is easy to say that people want to vote for "the man and not the party." But the present system weakens the traditional two parties by allowing candidates

to run without the discipline of party organization and assistance.

Again in the name of election reform, political parties have been restricted in the amount of cash and in-kind contributions they can give to candidates. This post-Watergate reform was institutionalized by a Supreme Court case, Buckley against Valeo, and decisions of the Federal Election Commission (FEC). Taxpayer funds make up most of the available moneys for Presidential candidates, once they qualify according to FEC guidelines. But the restriction on the assistance that can be given a candidate by the two national political parties has the result of leaving a good deal of slack to be made up by other organizations: special interest groups and political action committees (PAC's).

Neither special interest groups nor political action committees is bad. But because of their great numbers and influence, the voter is unable to demand the kind of accountability and responsiveness from such groups and committees as they formerly expected from the Republican and Democratic parties. It is even possible that the extreme costliness of congressional elections in the past 10 years has been made worse by the weakening of the two-party system in all phases of the electoral process, especially the funding of elections.

Here the role of incumbency comes into play. Special interest groups and PAC's have a very vital stake in the status quo. Whatever they find in Congress, they to seek in Congress, simply because such an arrangement is more predictable and easier to work with than a wave of new faces or leaderships election after election. By relying on funding of election from PAC's and special interest groups, incumbents in the House and Senate are insulated from the will of the American voter to an unreasonable extent. When combined with the enormous increases in the amount of perquisites available to incumbents which were enacted under the leadership of former Representative Wayne L. Hays, as chairman of the Committee on House Administration during the mid-1970's, the voters have their decisions effectively frustrated by the combination of weakened political parties and a self-serving congressional gravy train. Only by renewing the role of the two political parties can the Congress make sure that responsibility returns to the election process.

The result of the present system is to increase the number of political parties from 2 to 540. Each candidate for Congress becomes effectively a small political party, responsive to nobody except himself or herself. My legislation would reduce the relative importance of special interest groups

and PAC's by simply allowing the two political parties to have no limits on the amounts of in kind and cash assistance they can give to candidates. Because of the reporting requirements of the present law, the voters would have no trouble identifying where a candidate received support. Instead of wading through the goals and purposes of this or that special interest or political action group, the voter would have a much easier time evaluating the philosophical and issue differences between candidates for Congress. My legislation would in no way affect the existing disclosure requirements of political contributions.

My concern is that we correct a real problem, the weakening of the two-party system, rather than trying to restrict the powers of political action committees. It is obvious that PAC's developed in the post-Watergate era when a vacuum was created by the lessened powers of the Democratic and Republican parties to finance congressional elections. The Federal Election Commission's SUNPAC decision merely sought to balance the power of pro-labor special interests who had traditionally assisted in the funding of congressional elections by allowing corporate employees to form PAC's. Both pro-labor and probusiness political action committees have increased their influence on congressional election financing since SUNPAC, but they did not cause SUNPAC. Had the law allowed the Republican and Democratic parties to maintain their traditional funding roles, moneys raised by special interest groups and political action committees would automatically be controlled to a large extent.

To restrict political action committees without restoring the two-party system to vitality leaves only one option for the funding of congressional elections. The taxpayer would be saddled with such funding if neither political parties nor political action committees could manage the funding under the law. Obviously, taxpayer financing of congressional elections would be a logical extension of the incumbency protection measures instigated by former Congressman Hays. It would also encourage a proliferation of candidates within primaries, who would be propped up long after the voters lost interest by a tidal wave of taxpayer funds. Furthermore, nonaffiliated candidates would be encouraged to run with the backing of taxpayer funds in direct competition to candidates of the traditional two-party system, thereby further weakening the competitive position of them.

My legislation, in restoring the traditional role of the two traditional parties, would restore among voters the opportunity to evaluate and hold responsible candidates for Congress from the Democratic or Republican

parties. It would tend to reduce the relative role of special interests and political action committees by allowing the bulk of congressional funding to be handled by the two parties. It would discourage taxpayer funding of elections, and the additional burden on the Federal budget, by allowing private financing through the vehicle of the traditional parties. It would diminish the chances of successful nonparty affiliated candidates as well as prevent incumbent protection which would be the natural result of taxpayer funding of congressional elections. Moreover, my legislation would restore to health a system that has worked well for nearly 200 years rather than building a Rube Goldberg system in which the voter has every right to lack confidence.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the support by our colleagues of the Voter Interest and Participation Act of 1983, H.R. 2976. ●

#### EXPLANATION FOR MISSED VOTE

**HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote on rollcall No. 299, which sought to close portions of the Department of Defense authorizations conference report (S. 675). Had I been present on August 1, 1983, I would have voted "aye." ●

#### AMERICA'S PROGRESS TOWARD CIVIL RIGHTS REFORM

**HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the House voted overwhelmingly to honor the birthday of Martin Luther King. Were Dr. King here today to witness our consideration of H.R. 2230, I wonder if he would be encouraged by our progress over the past two decades in civil rights reform.

Today, when we vote on this bill to reauthorize and extend the authority of the Civil Rights Commission, I hope all of my colleagues will consider the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS). This is a compromise amendment to try to depoliticize this very important Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to oppose all amendments to weaken the Edwards compromise and to vote to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for the next 5 years. It is very important, and we owe that to

our country and to Dr. King's memory.

If we look back, there is much to consider about how this legislation will affect the future direction of civil rights in the United States. When the Commission was formed in 1957, prejudice and segregation were commonplace in our society: in education, in employment, in housing, and in our minds. Not a single portion of our society was spared the markings of racial injustice. In parts of the country, drinking fountains bore the signs of discrimination. Even our institutions perpetuated prejudicial attitudes, until, by the courage of some rare and courageous individuals, we were made to recognize our folly as human beings.

In 1955, when Ms. Rosa Parks, a black seamstress in Montgomery, Ala., refused to move "to the back of the bus," she was jailed. The poignance of her act, and others like hers, touched off one of the most significant revolutions in American history. Prior to the civil rights revolution, racial prejudice and social injustice were the accepted norm. Civil rights were forcefully denied, and fear kept many from challenging the power of fiat. Today, while the signs of blatant discrimination might not be as openly displayed, the subtle signs of a not-so-glorious past persist.

Just yesterday, the fairness of voting practices in the primary election of a southern State (Mississippi), were brought into the question. Were it not for the Civil Rights Commission, a fair and independent assessment of voting practices throughout our Nation would not have been made. Without the Civil Rights Commission, the Voting Rights Act would not be on the books today.

The independent, comprehensive studies and recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission have had a tremendous influence on policymaking. To mire debate about the structure of the Commission in controversy, or to make Commission members submissive to any President, whim to fire without cause, would result in the unconscionable demise of the Commission.

The debate here today must not focus on the dismal record of the Reagan administration with respect to civil rights. Rather, it must focus on the long-term integrity of the Commission. The authorization for the Commission is due to expire on September 30, but its work is far from complete. Yet somehow, there are Members of this body and of the Senate who would seek to entangle the appointments process in debate over whether to reauthorize the Commission at all. This is not the time to impose a structure on the composition of the Commission, nor is it the time



to permit the President to fire "at whim" those Commissioners who would not agree with his policies. Neither this administration, nor any future administration, should be permitted to tamper with the work of the Commission. It must remain the objective voice of our diverse citizenry, untainted by political controversy, supportive of civil rights reform, and strengthened by fairness.

August 28 will mark the 20th anniversary of the orderly assembly of over a quarter of a million people in front of the Lincoln Memorial. In the midst of this peaceful pilgrimage for civil rights, Dr. Martin Luther King spoke out. He spoke of a dream which resounds for us today. He spoke of his four children that they would "one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character."

Dr. King's dream was once considered fantastic. Today, with pride, we can boast that in many ways it has become reality. The Civil Rights Commission has greatly affected this change. It has forced us to look at our society, examine our institutions, and reform our laws. It must remain the independent appraiser of equal protection under law for Dr. King's children and for generations to come. Let us preserve the effectiveness of the Civil Rights Commission through passage of the Edwards amendment.●

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 154—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO COMMEND DR. ALICE RIVLIN

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay a much deserved tribute to Dr. Alice Rivlin upon her retirement as Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

As a member of the Budget Committee, it has been my pleasure to work closely with Alice Rivlin for the last 5 years. I have been consistently impressed by the high standards of professionalism and nonpartisanship she brought to CBO and by her readiness to respond frankly to questions even when her answers were unpopular.

Alice is the only Director that CBO has ever had. She built, from scratch, an organization which has become an indispensable part of Congress. In addition to its timely and objective forecasts, its examinations of Federal fiscal priorities, and its options for reducing the deficit, CBO has sent to Congress welcome analyses of pressing issues. We simply could not do without CBO.

I will miss having Alice Rivlin at the helm of CBO. She leaves us, however, knowing that she has well served the Congress and the American people. The esteem in which CBO is held is her monument.

I would like to thank Alice Rivlin for her wise counsel during her tenure at CBO and to wish her well in her endeavors at the Brookings Institution. I am glad that she will remain close by because I am sure that, as we proceed to address the severe economic problems facing the Nation, we will need her wisdom and insight.

I wish her the very best of luck in the next chapter of her distinguished career.●

A TRIBUTE TO KURT WEISHAUP

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, once upon a time, in a land far away, in a lifetime almost forgotten, the world had gone mad. Persecution, violence, upheaval, torture, destruction, death—it was a nightmare beyond what language can describe. That tempestuous period of history, however, drove Kurt Weishaupt and his lovely bride Trude to the shores of America.

He came here, not with his hands open, but with his arms outstretched. He came here, not bitter, as he had every right to be, and not morbid, as one might have expected. His world was destroyed, but he came here with hopes, and dreams, and aspirations. He came here with a yearning to live in peace, untouched by prejudice, and with a desire to build a strong, loving family.

And that he did, Mr. Speaker. He built on his hopes and his dreams, and he built a family whose love for one another knows no bounds, and whose desire to help their fellow human beings seems endless.

Recently, Kurt Weishaupt turned 70. Yet he shows no sign of slowing down, no slacking of his determination to help others less fortunate than himself. He remembers what the world was like when he was young, and he works to insure that the world will never again be so cruel.

That is why Kurt is chairman of the board of the Gift of Life program. Even in our modern age, with all our technological advances, there are many terribly sick children all over the world who are not getting the high-quality medical attention they so desperately need. Kurt and Trude, and those who work with them, give these children the Gift of Life, placing them in American hospitals where they can be properly treated, and raising funds

to cover the costs of the expensive care they require. Kurt has been to Korea, for example, twice in the past 3 years, arranging treatment for over 100 sick Korean children.

The Gift of Life program is only one outlet for the energies of this great American philanthropist. Within his hometown of Flushing, he is vice president of the Boys' Club, which over the years has provided constructive recreational activities for thousands of local underprivileged youngsters. He is on the board of directors of the Flushing YMCA, and he is a new board member of Bowne House, the historic landmark in Queens which was the birthplace of freedom of religion in America. Just recently Kurt concluded a term as president of the Rotary Club of Flushing, and he serves on the board of trustees of Queens' Booth Memorial Medical Center, a busy, urban hospital which has often benefited from his philanthropic interest.

Kurt has long been involved with stamp collecting, as both a vocation and an avocation. He is vice president of the International Stamp Dealers Association and a past president of the American Stamp Dealers Association. What is a hobby for others, however, is just another way to contribute for him. He is a founding member of Philatelic Hobbies for the Wounded. Since 1948, he has been chairman of the March of Dimes stamp and coin division, and since 1952, he has been co-chairman of the United Jewish Appeal stamp and coin division.

Mr. Speaker, one can only imagine the awe and joy with which Trude and Kurt must have first stepped upon this great land of ours, how grateful they must have left. The irony, however, is that it is America, although unknown at the time, that should have been grateful; for Kurt and Trude, who came from far away, with nothing but their self respect, had actually adopted us.

They have reinforced the values upon which this great Nation was built; they have retaught us the real meaning of humanity, of brotherhood, and of decency. The nightmare and the tragedy that drove them from a world so far away on a journey filled with fear and trepidation ended on the day that Kurt and Trude breathed free air. At the time, Mr. Speaker, that day meant little to anyone except the Weishaupts. We know now that, though unheralded at that time, it was indeed a truly great day for the United States of America.

Kurt and Trude Weishaupt are the absolute embodiment of the American way, the American dream. They serve as an inspiration to all of us, each and every day, teaching us what humanitarianism is all about. Surely, hundreds of Americans, myself included,

as well as countless others all over this globe, have found their lives enriched simply by knowing Kurt and Trude Weishaupt.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and all of our colleagues in the Congress of the United States will join me in wishing happy birthday to this great American, to this great humanitarian, and in wishing him and his lovely wife many, many, many more years of productivity, satisfaction, love, and joy. ●

#### AUGUST 21: A DAY CZECHOSLOVAKIA WILL REMEMBER

**HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, August 21 is an important day for Czechoslovakian people all over the world. On this day in 1968, the armed forces of the Soviet Union invaded the defenseless nation of Czechoslovakia and stamped out the Czechoslovakian people's movement toward freedom. Fifteen years later, we commemorate that fateful day, and take note that the freedoms which we today enjoy in the United States must constantly be defended.

The invasion by Soviet and Eastern European troops was swift and decisive. Over 650,000 troops swept across the Czechoslovakian land and seized key state, party, and legislative officials. Reform leaders were taken to Moscow for interrogation. Martial law was declared. There was some passive resistance, such as the clandestine radio stations that broadcast all over the country, but the Czechoslovakian epithets were no match for the Soviet tanks. Czechoslovakia's brief encounter with the basic freedoms that are enjoyed in the West was quickly and violently ended.

What we commemorate on August 21 is not only the subjugation of one people by another, but the basic struggle for rights and freedoms that goes on daily around the world. Hungary in the 1950's, Czechoslovakia in 1968, and Poland in 1980 have all demonstrated that totalitarian governments can be installed in a country, but the desire of the people for freedom and justice cannot be eliminated.

It is no accident that the Soviet Union must rule Eastern Europe with an iron fist. The drive for freedom and dignity that resides within the people of the Eastern bloc is strong and cannot be eliminated. This determination is reflected in numerous events of the past 30 years. The various uprisings against the Communists, the passive resistance displayed by the Czechs in 1968 and Poland's continuing labor struggle are all vivid demonstrations of the will for freedom in Eastern Europe.

Today, 15 years after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, the Czech people enjoy no more freedom than they did in the 1960's, and the Soviet presence is just as pervasive. As Americans and proud citizens of the greatest democracy on Earth, it is up to us to provide a beacon of freedom for oppressed people to look toward, and an example of liberty and justice for all the world to admire. While democracy is certainly safe in our land, it is not necessarily permanent. As Thomas Jefferson said, "Eternal vigilance is the price we pay for liberty." We in this country have been blessed with a government and a people that make it possible for us to enjoy the freedoms of which our Czechoslovakian brothers can only dream. To help the oppressed people of Eastern Europe, and around the world, we should set an example of freedom and justice that everyone can follow.

It is a tribute to the strength and determination of the Czechoslovakian people that they could move toward freedom in 1968 in spite of the specter of Soviet domination. I congratulate the Denni Hlasatel newspaper and its editor, Joseph Kucera, for memorializing this anniversary and reminding us of one people's struggle for freedom. Commemoration of the August 21, 1968, invasion of Czechoslovakia reaffirms both our support for the Czechoslovakian people, and our dedication to making freedom and dignity a reality for people around the world. ●

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. TOM CORCORAN**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for the roll-call vote on the Levin amendment to H.R. 2780, State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act Amendments of 1983, which occurred on Tuesday, August 2.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no." ●

#### SHRINE TO ST. THOMAS MORE

**HON. BILL ARCHER**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, last month marked the commemoration of the anniversary of the death of St. Thomas More, the patron saint of lawyers and all government workers, who was led to the executioner's ax and martyrdom in London on July 6, 1535.

Sir Thomas More, during his long career in law and political life, was a Member of Parliament and was elected Speaker of the House of Commons; he

also held the high office of Lord Chancellor of England and several lesser diplomatic and judicial posts. He was always a deeply religious and holy man, as evidenced by his beatification in 1886 and canonization in 1935. But in his lifetime, Thomas More was also a preeminent English and European scholar, author, lawyer, theologian, humanist, diplomat, philosopher, politician, and counsel to the King. Throughout his public and political life, moreover, he maintained constantly a devoted and active personal interest in his large family and household. In this, I believe he set an unique and enduring example for us all.

Many in Congress will be pleased to learn that we now have nearby on Capitol Hill a new statue and small shrine to St. Thomas More, located just inside St. Joseph's Church at Second and C Streets NE. The necessary renovation work to enable the statue to be displayed was completed through the generous support of the Thomas More Society of America and with the special efforts of my good friend, Rev. Msgr. John J. Murphy, S.T.L., pastor of St. Joseph's Church on Capitol Hill.

On June 22, 1983, the feast day of St. Thomas More, Monsignor Murphy celebrated a special noontime Mass in honor of Thomas More and dedicated the statue. He was assisted in the liturgy by the Rev. Robert J. Petrella, pastor of the Church of St. Thomas More in southeast Washington, by the Rev. Ladislav Orsy, S.J., of Catholic University, and by Rev. Michael J. Murray, associate pastor of St. Joseph's. The Rev. Msgr. John A. O'Connell, rector of the Cathedral of St. Thomas More in Arlington, Va., was the homilist.

On the prie-dieu or kneeler placed before the More statue in St. Joseph's, for the benefit of those with a special devotion to this saint, is a prayer composed by Hon. Howard T. Markey, chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit and the founder of the Thomas More Society. It is adapted from a prayer originally written for lawyers, and reads as follows:

St. Thomas More, be our advocate and counsel before the Divine tribunal that alone is without error.

Bespeak for us the wisdom to apply the precepts of God's eternal law to the problems of our daily lives.

Intercede for us that we may emulate the sense of humor which made your heart echo with the mirth of heaven.

Pray that we may spurn false oaths and live as You did, faithful to our faith, even though by doing so we may be called upon to sacrifice our all as You sacrificed yours.

These things seek for us through the merits of Jesus Christ, Our Lord. Amen. ●



## DON'T PLAY "BLAME THE SCHOOLS"

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, our educational system needs reform. We recognize the need for higher standards, stricter discipline, and more clearly defined goals. However, few people accept that in order to achieve meaningful, lasting reform, we must also reform the societal perception of education. Society must recognize the fundamental role of education.

Education is the foundation of society. Our educational system has given us a largely literate society. Our national preeminence in technology is largely due to the training researchers received in this educational system. Our schools provide the citizenship education vital to a representative democracy. Attempts at educational reform should recognize the basic need for education, and the myriad roles and types of training schools perform. Thomas Jefferson understood the importance of education to society: "A civilization which expects to be both ignorant and free expects that which never was and never will be."

Educational reform must also recognize that schools are strongly affected by societal changes. Through major societal changes and events of the past decades—the baby boom, technological revolutions, wars, a "drug culture," rising divorce rates, and the breakdown of the traditional family—schools persevered with amazing resiliency and continuity. Yet we see the effects of these changes in the schoolroom in lack of discipline, short attention spans, and immature children facing adult problems.

Ben Harris, a professor of educational administration at the University of Texas at Austin, wrote about these issues. Mr. Harris asks us not to play

games with educational reform. He recognizes schools' strengths, and asks society's support in shaping reasonable solutions. I particularly call to your attention his recommendation that providing in-service education for teachers would produce better results than merit pay. I commend this article to my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 2, 1983]

## DON'T PLAY "BLAME THE SCHOOLS"

(By Ben M. Harris)

American schools have many problems. They reflect the problems of the larger society and long decades of public neglect. But critics of many stripes seem bent upon some "quick fix" and generally fail to either diagnose or prescribe with thoughtful logic. At least three realities seem largely ignored or misrepresented by much of the current media treatment of the public education scene in this nation:

1. The public schools have many very serious problems, but they have demonstrated enormous strengths as well. Schools have accommodated to "baby booms," teacher shortages, and deteriorating facilities with stability and continuity of service to all. They have adapted their programs to accommodate slow learners, handicapped, emotionally disturbed, and a constantly changing set of social values.

In recent years, a new record was set in holding power—75 percent of all secondary-age youth were actually in school for the first time in America's history. Illiteracy has been so completely eradicated among students that new and more demanding standards called "adult competence" or "life skills" have replaced the literacy measures used throughout most of the world to reflect national progress.

2. The teachers of America's schools number approximately 2.5 million—the largest group of college graduates in any one occupational endeavor. They determine, in a large measure, what the unique contribution of the school will be to student progress, but they don't do it alone. Responsibility for the quality of education is heavily shared by parents and the larger community.

Even so, the persistent teacher shortage of the past 30 years has left its scars. The shortages were never seriously addressed by our people or our politicians. School officials were forced, decade after decade, to

accept virtually all applicants with minimum qualifications. Few teachers have had anything approximating the amount or quality of professional training offered to virtually every other profession.

These failures to recruit, select, or adequately train have been compounded by the persistent refusal of boards, legislatures, and the Congress to fund in-service training programs in the face of obvious needs.

Our Johnny-come-lately critics seem utterly unaware that the youthful teaching force of the nation (average age in mid-30s) is ready and willing to upgrade its practices through retraining, in-service education, and human resource development programs. Instead these critics offer warmed-over, long discredited "merit pay" plans that would not produce needed results in any case.

3. The schools are "at risk" from persistent scapegoating and public neglect. A bit of reflection is required to recall the Rudolf Flesch mania for phonics in the 1940s, the new math panacea in the 1950s, the TV curriculum projects bypassing the classroom teacher in the '60s, and the back to basics with minimum competency testing of the 1970s. Each is an example of doomed-to-failure efforts at "school reform," foisted upon school officials by vested interest groups and unknowing, self-appointed critics. The 1980s are off to another decade of capricious, ill-conceived, politically motivated meddling in the affairs of our schools.

The parents of the nation should be aroused. Their children have become pawns in an incessant game called "blame the school." The right of each child to a curriculum that suits his or her individual needs is being abridged. The rights and responsibilities of parents to work closely with teachers and local school officials to provide an education that is supportive of family life and consistent with their aspirations for their children are being frustrated. Finally, the wisdom and technical expertise of 150,000 school administrators and supervisors and hundreds of thousands of fine experienced teachers is being literally wasted.

A new era has come upon the land and sown chaos in our schools. We cannot return to the past, but we can reaffirm the rights of students, parents, teachers, and school officials to shape locally and personally the education of each learner. We need cheerleaders, an enthusiastic crowd of supporters, a few responsible officials, some water boys, too! But too many coaches interfering with players' efforts is a sure way to lose the game. ●